



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

taken through the beginners' book since then, and they have never failed to clear the matter up at once. Here they are:

1. Write down the words as they are found in the vocabulary.
2. Erase the accent on the enclitic.
3. Put an acute on the last syllable of the word preceding the enclitic, unless it already has an accent.
4. Avoid (a) two successive acutes; (b) three successive unaccented syllables.
5. If 4(a) results, erase the new accent. Then if 4(b) results, restore the accent to the enclitic.

The process of erasing and adding the accents becomes quite unnecessary after a few trials; the student soon sees the changes in his mind, and presently learns where to put the accent without any mechanical process whatsoever. Diligent attention to the rules usually given brings about the same result, of course, but I am confident that any teacher who will give his class the rules suggested will find a rather perplexing difficulty eased away at once.

CHARLES B. RANDOLPH

CLARK COLLEGE, WORCESTER, MASS.

ON "FALCES PRAEACUTAE," CAES. B.G. III. 14. 5

That our standard American lexicon (the *Harper's Latin Dictionary*, edited by Lewis and Short in 1879) is far from being up to date is well known, and its deficiencies have not been made good by any work in the English language with which I am acquainted. In fact this book, which has not been revised since its publication thirty years ago, may still be called the standard lexicon of England and America. The reason for this state of affairs is pretty well known, and need not be enlarged upon.

The Germans are much better off than we are, for Georges' *Handwörterbuch* is frequently issued in a revised edition, and except for the omission in most cases of the exact references for the passages cited from the Latin writers, is remarkably good. This feature, however, while in accordance with the purpose and plan of the book, makes it inadequate for some of the needs of the student, which, it is but fair to say, it was doubtless never intended to serve.

The old Forcellini, therefore, in the revision of De Vit (1860-75) is still the only Latin lexicon which is reasonably complete and satisfactory, except the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, as far as it goes. Of course the Forcellini-De Vit cannot include the results of the discoveries of the last forty years or so, but it is often superior to the more modern dictionaries, most of which are directly or indirectly based upon its collections of material.

This appears, for example, in the word *praeacutus*, which it defines as *in anteriore parte acutus vel valde acutus*. The second part of this definition has been discarded, whether by oversight or by design, in the newer lexicons, but

it seems called for in some uses of the word. Georges cites only *stipites* (Caes.), *sudes* (Sall.), and *cuspis* (Ovid), and in all these cases the meaning "sharpened at the end" or "pointed" is appropriate enough, although the epithet might seem somewhat otiose in Ovid *Met.* vii, 131. This is not the case however with the *falces praeacutae* of Caesar, *B.G.* iii.14. 5 These instruments were *insertae adfixaeque longuriis* and were *non absimili forma muralium falcium*. *His* (Caesar continues) *cum funes, qui antemnas ad malos destinabant comprehensi adductique erant, remigio remis incitato praerumpebantur*. It is obvious that the *falces* were sharpened, not at the point, or not only at the point, but on their edge; and even if they had projecting points as well, like the *falces murales* which they are said to resemble to some extent, this fact is of no significance compared with the keenness of the blade. I should therefore go back to Forcellini and translate *praeacutae* by "very sharp," a thing which none of the vocabularies to Caesar do, so far as I am aware.

That *prae-* in composition has both meanings is well known; see for example Stolz, *Hist. lat. Gramm.* I, 398, where the group to which *praeacutus* in the sense of "sharpened at the end" belongs does not seem to be represented. Examples of compounds with *prae-* which have a double meaning are perhaps *praeaculus*, *in anteriore parte calvus vel valde calvus*, and *praeanus*, *valde vel ante tempus canus*; at least the scholiasts seem to have been able to understand these words either way.

The intensive force of *praeacutus* seems the better one in Plin. *N.H.* viii. 26, *ita pendens alterum populem dextra caedit ac praeacuta bipenni hoc crure tardato profugiens alterius populi nervos ferit*, for an axe is sharpened, not on its end, but on its edge, and even if *praeacutus* could mean "sharpened on the edge," why should this very obvious feature of an axe be emphasized? The meaning "very sharp" or "keen" seems invariably the better one when *praeacutus* is applied to edged tools. With stakes, and the like, "pointed" is usually the natural meaning.

In some cases one might well be in doubt which of the two meanings to choose, for example that of the *scopuli praeacuti* of Pliny *N.H.* viiii. 38, where the adjective is variously rendered by the translators. The *squamae praeacutae* of the strange fishes described by Pliny in *N.H.* viiii. 69, are likened by him to *clavi caligares*, or hob-nails. To judge from Pliny's words, and from Cuvier's and Rondelet's description of the fish, which apparently make their appearance in modern times for a brief season, at the same time of year, in the lakes of northern Italy, they had large scales, in the middle of each of which was a small sharp point. Pliny's comparison with hob-nails then would seem to refer to the general appearance of a soldier's boot studded with such nails rather than to the points of the nails. Bostock and Riley's translation, "remarkable for the number of their scales and their exceeding sharpness," seems to take *prae-* in an intensive sense, as I should be inclined to do. It must be admitted, however, that in this case the other meaning is not impossible.

I am disposed to see the same intensive force of *prae-* in *praerumpebantur*, in the same sentence as the *falces praeacutae*; i.e., the ropes which bound the yards to the mast were violently torn apart. That this really means that they were cut, is shown by *abscisis* at the beginning of the next sentence. This force of *prae-* is sometimes present in *praecido* and *praefringo*, which are like *praeacutus* in being used in a double sense, while in *praeifulgeo* the intensive force is apparently the only one. In the case of all these words the definitions of the Forcellini-De Vit are better than those of the more modern lexicons and vocabularies, so far as I have examined the latter.

That Caesar unquestionably uses *praeacutus* in some connections with the meaning "sharpened at the end" is of course no reason for supposing that he always used the word in the same sense.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA